



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—NOTES ON THE TEXT OF ASKLEPIODOTOS.

The Τέχνη Τακτική of Asklepiodotos, the philosopher, is contained in only a small number of MSS, the oldest, best-known and most accessible of which I shall discuss below. The first five are given the symbols employed by Hermann Köchly.¹

F = Florentinus, i. e. Laurentianus LV, 4, membr., s. X, no. 7, 132^a-142^b.²

V = Vallicellanus 130, chart., s. XVIII.³

A = Parisinus 2522, chart., s. XV, 52^b-77^b.⁴

¹ In the first, and so far the only, edition of Asklepiodotos, published in H. Köchly and W. Rüstow: Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller, II, 1, Leipzig, 1855 (henceforth referred to as "K. and R.").

² This is the famous MS of the Greek Tacticians, described best in Bandini: Catal. Codd. Mss. Graec. Bibl. Laur., II, 218-38, and K. K. Müller: Festschrift für L. Urlichs, Würzburg, 1880, pp. 105-8. Of this MS Köchly knew only the few words which were quoted by Bandini.

³ See E. Martini: Catal. di Manosc. Greci esist. nelle Bibl. Ital. II, 1902, Cat. Cod. Graec. qui in Bibl. Vallicellana Romae adservantur, p. 202. This MS was copied by Leo Allatius (1586-1669), Professor of Greek in the Greek Collegium at Rome and later Librarian of the Vatican, direct from the Laurentian at Florence. A small portion of it was printed by Angelo Mai: Spicilegium Romanum, vol. IV, Rome, 1840, pp. 578-81. K. and R. are in error when they assert (p. 128) that this MS was in the Vatican. Mai merely reports that he saw it in Rome.

⁴ This MS Köchly collated himself, as he remarks apropos of the Anon. Byzant. (K. and R., II, 2, p. 4) although he says nothing about the matter in the introductory note to Asklepiodotos. That he had done so in time to use his own collations for the edition of Asklepiodotos is not impossible, because it came out in the same year, 1855, as the Anonymus Byzantinus. But there is no certainty that he did, and in the notes of his edition of 1855, he manifests no more familiarity with the readings of ABC than he had shown in the *apparatus criticus* which he published along with the first three paragraphs of the first chapter of Asklepiodotos in the *Index Lectionum*, Zürich, 1852, for which he secured his knowledge of the MSS almost certainly from Huntziker (see note 6 below). That Köchly had this MS in time for the edition of Aeneas (1853) is most improbable for he does not speak of this MS [for Aeneas = B] as though he had then seen it, and he refers to it only very rarely in his notes. On the whole it seems nearly certain that for

B = Parisinus 2435, chart., s. XVI, 75a-85b.⁵

C = Parisinus 2528, chart., s. XVII.⁶

D = Parisinus 2447, chart., s. XVI, 1-16.

E = Parisinus Suppl. Grec 83, chart., 1652, 74-91.^{6a}

F is the archetype of V, A, B and C as is generally recognized.⁷ Although an old and excellent MS it does not give us an impeccable text. Errors of itacism are tolerably frequent, but need no enumeration. The tendency to write prepositional phrases as a single word is marked. Thus, Chapter heading γ', καθόλην; I, 2 ἀπεναντίας; I, 3 διελεφάντων, etc. Sheer blunders are not so very common. Thus, II, 8 ἐπὶ for ἔτι; *ibid.* 9 ἐξ ἀριθμοὶ for ἐξάριθμοι; III, 2 τὴν δὲ for δὲ τὴν, etc. Evidence that F was copied with fidelity may be seen in numerous instances where the scribe is clearly reproducing merely what he thought he saw, without trying to make either words or sense out of it. The archetype was occasionally lacunose or illegible. It seems not to have been as bad, however, as that of Aeneas in these respects. Indications of lacunae in the original appear very rarely; thus, according to Dr. Rostagno's collation, only in X, 8

all three of these Paris MSS K. and R. had only the collations of Huntziker available when the text of Asklepiodotos was published. Cf. note 6 below.

⁵ Collated for K. and R. probably by Huntziker; see notes 4 and 6.

⁶ Köchly: Index Lect., Zürich, 1852, p. 10, K. and R., p. 129, and II, 2, p. 3 for A, assign all three of the Paris MSS to the 16th century, which is absurd for one written, as C is, by Cl. Salmasius (1588-1653). The dates given above are those of Omont in the Inventaire Sommaire. K. and R. derived their knowledge of C from a collation prepared by Jakob Huntziker. This is not definitely stated, so far as I can find, but is implied by Köchly: Index Lect., Zürich, 1852, pp. 4 and 10 (cf. K. and R., p. 212). Also in K. and R. occasional statements about certain readings of C are given in quotation marks, as though on someone's authority, and twice, X, 16 and XI, 7, Huntziker is named as that authority. In general it might be said of Huntziker's collations that they are not complete enough, and an editor would frequently like more information. It is certainly not safe to infer anything from silence about the reading of any of these MSS.

^{6a} The MS was copied at Stockholm by P. D. Huet.

⁷ K. and R., p. 129, had conjectured that such was the case even without having seen F. I owe my knowledge of it to the admirable collation kindly prepared for me by Prof. Dott. Enrico Rostagno of the Laurentian Library at Florence. All my statements about F are, therefore, made upon his high authority.

τὸν ἐμεν (space for 3 letters) for τὸν ἔμπροσθεν, and XII, 11 ἐπιδου (space for 4 letters) for ἐπὶ δόρυ. Elsewhere the scribe of F seems not to have noticed that anything was missing. How these numerous omissions are to be explained in a text otherwise pretty carefully copied is a question to which I find no answer suggested by the present state of F. Possibly a remote ancestor had been seriously damaged, and the next copyist simply left out what was hard to read. Fortunately the very technical subject-matter enables the editor to make many restorations with complete certainty, while other passages can be recovered by means of the numerous direct or indirect quotations in Aelian, Arrian, and the Military Lexicon (see below, p. 140).

For V we are informed by Mai and Martini that it was copied from the Laurentian MS,⁸ and this is obvious from a mere glance at its readings. We know it only from Mai's publication of chapters I-II, 9 (inclusive). K. and R. used Mai, but as my own collation shows a dozen additional variant readings, their work was none too carefully done. The number of variants from F is large, but not all are due to Allatius; such absurdities as τὴν ἀπολειπόμενον (II, 9); πρόσωπος (II, 5); τολὸν (II, 2); δέχα (II, 7), impossible for a native Greek, are certainly typographical errors. Inasmuch as F is still perfectly legible, except in some of the diagrams, which V seems to have omitted anyway,⁹ the only value V can have must lie in the emendations of Allatius, and it is these (disregarding entirely mere errors¹⁰) which we shall examine.

I, 2 οὔτε θώραξι κεκοσμημένον F: κοσμούμενον V. A needless and unjustifiable change.

I, 3 διὰ τὸ συνεπισκέπτεσθαι καὶ τὸν ἵππον F: συνεπισκέπεσθαι V. An obvious and easy change which strangely escaped Salmasius.

⁸ This statement was probably made in the MS itself, for it is given by both Mai and Martini, although neither had any special knowledge of the Laurentian MS.

⁹ Mai makes no mention of them, nor, indeed, of the introductory list of chapters.

¹⁰ These were probably not so numerous as Mai's text would lead one to imagine, for Allatius seems ordinarily to have copied with commendable accuracy, except when he emended. Thus, in the heading of chapter I, V following F has φαλάγγων, ABC φάλαγγος; so I, 2 ἀπεναντίας V, ἀπ' ἐναντίας ABC; II, 1 λυμαίνεται V, λυμαίνεται ABC; II, 3 τοὺς τε V, τοὺς δὲ ABC, etc.

I, 3 οἱ δὲ τοῖς ἄκροις ἐπικοινωνοῦντες οἱ μὲν τόξοις, οἱ δὲ ἀκοντίοις μάχονται F: οἱ δὲ τοῖς ἄκροις V. An absurd change which destroys the sense of the passage.

I, 3 καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ χρώμενοι σκευῇ (l. ἄλλῃ) F: αὐτῇ V, followed by K. and R. ἄλλῃ is preferable because it means the equipment other than that of bows and javelins just mentioned. Now the heavy cavalry did not use javelins, but long heavy spears (see just above), hence to say that the branch of the intermediate cavalry which resembled the heavy cavalry used the same equipment is incorrect; it was only the rest of the equipment (i. e., apart from the javelins) which was identical with that of the heavy cavalry. The emendation has only a superficial plausibility, but on closer examination turns out to be false.

II, 1 σύμμετρα δέ ἐστι θέμενα τὰ τιθέμενα τὰ μέρη μηδὲν τὴν φάλαγγα πρὸς τὴν μάχην λυμαίνηται (l. λυμαίνεται) F: σ. δ. ἐστι θέμενα τὰ μέρη ᾧ μηδὲν κτλ. V. The serious corruption here was in F's archetype. First τά must have dropped out and then ἐστιθέμενα was written by haplography. Next the correction, probably in the form τὰ τιθέμενα ᾧ was entered, and both error and correction were copied in F, whose scribe probably completed the confusion by supposing that ᾧ belonged before μέρη and so changing it to τά. The one perfectly obvious emendation, the restoration of the relative ᾧ after μέρη V did, indeed, make, but even the simple expedient of excluding the meaningless θέμενα seems to have been beyond his powers. The correct emendation of a passage like this was, of course, easy for a scholar like Salmasius.

II, 2 συνωμετια F: συνωμοσιά (the accent probably due to Mai or the printer) V. Perfectly obvious emendation, made in all the other MSS as well.

II, 4 towards the end, the words ἡ ἐπιστάται . . . παραστάται are omitted by V. If this was really done by Allatius, not by Mai, or the printer, it is probably due to a belief that these words were a gloss, a view which would have been dispelled by even a very little study of the context.

II, 5 ἐστι F: εἴη V. Unnecessary and no improvement.

II, 7 δι' ὃ F: καί V. The recommendation to select numbers evenly divisible by two down to unity is a direct consequence of the preceding clause, so that the emendation καί is altogether wrong.

II, 8 *ἔσονται δὴ* F: *δέ* V. Unnecessary and less effective.

II, 9 *ἐξ ἀριθμοί* F: *ἐνάρθμοι* V. F's reading requires only the simplest change to *ἐξάρθμοι*. V's emendation makes nonsense.

II, 9 *ἡμιάφορον . . . τὸν δ' οἶσι* F: *ἡμιάφορον . . . ὁτίω* [1] V. What shall we think of the critical ability of a scholar who was unable to emend so obvious an error, particularly when the definition of the term was so broadly hinted at in the very next words, *εἰ μὴ φωνῆς κατακοῖνεν ἐνδέχοιτο διὰ θόρυβον*?

II, 9 *ὅποτε δ' εἰ μὴ δ' εἰσημει.* *ὄν* F: *δὲ μὴδὲ σημείον* V. The correction to *σημείον* is too simple to deserve any credit, and nonsense is created by the retention of *δέ*. An archetype probably had *ὅποτε δέ* with the correction *μὴδέ* for *δέ* and then F, or its original, ran the two together.

II, 9 *τόγε μὴν* F: *τό γε μὲν* V. The correction is obvious, *τόν γε μὴν*. What Allatius could have meant by his changes I have no idea.

With this paragraph Mai's excerpt from V ends, but no more is needed. The character of the thirteen characteristic readings given above, where all but the very simplest corrections are wrong, is sufficient to show that Allatius, whatever his other attainments as a scholar, did not concern himself sufficiently with his task in this instance to deserve anything of Asklepiodotos. It would be a waste of time for any one to collate V in full for any more of his emendations.

A has been copied with great fidelity, but probably not direct from F itself, although it reproduces minutely almost all of its errors (see below under B). It introduces only a small number of changes, which are always wrong,¹¹ except in the most obvious matters.¹² A second hand emends successfully in IV, 1 *διαστηκασι* of F to *διαστημάτων*, and two marginal readings (VII, 7 *ἴσοις* F changed to *ὄσοις*, and X, 2 *νπερασως* F changed to *ὑπερκεράσεως*) hit the correct word. Otherwise the MS is valueless.

B varies a little more from F than does A and contains a

¹¹ For example, I, 3 *τούς τε ἵππους* F: *τοὺς δὲ* A (also in B and C); III title *ἡ κατὰ τὰ μέρη* F: *κατὰ μέρη* A (unnecessary, if not merely a case of haplography); VII, 8 *ἐκάτερα* F: *ἐκατέρα* A, where *ἐκάτερα* is required.

¹² For example, II, 2 *συνωμετια* F: *συνωμοτία* A (and all the other MSS); II, 10 *φιε'* F: *φιβ'* A (obvious to any one who can multiply by two).

comparatively large number of gross blunders. It was not copied from A, as is clear from the way in which it retains a few peculiar errors in F which are not in A. Thus I, 3 F has *περισκέπων* changed to *περισκέπον*, A has *περισκέπον* and B *περισκέπων*; II, 2 F and B (1st hand) have *συνωμετια*, A *συνωμοτία*. On the other hand A and B are obviously very closely related, because both omit the last thirteen words of X, 10, while such senseless errors as II, 7 *ἀρτιακεις* A B for *ἀρτιάκις* F; VI, 1 *οὐκ ἔστιν* for *οὐκέτι*; and XI, 2 *πήκται* A *ὀπηκται* B for *ἐπηται* F point clearly to a common archetype which must have been a very faithful copy of F, reproducing even both readings in the case of a correction, as in I, 3 mentioned above. B's own changes in no case really emend the text and as a MS B accordingly is worthless. Its marginal readings are, however, interesting and will be taken up in connection with the next MS.

C coming from the pen of Salmasius has, of course, a high value because of its emendations, even though, since the great man was merely copying a MS and not editing a text, he often did not take time to emend all the corruptions, many of which could not in any case have been cured without the aid of the parallel versions in Aelian and Arrian. Mere slips in C have not been recorded, but all the important emendations have, except in those fairly frequent cases where Salmasius' conjecture has been confirmed by the examination of F. C was copied from B (or a descendant of B), because it not only reproduces some of B's peculiar errors like XI, 6 *τετραμερία* for *τετραμερία*; XII, 11 *μὲν* for *μέντοι*; ¹³ but omits regularly what B alone omits, as II, 1 *εις*; IX, 1 *τό*; XI, 7 *δέ*; or else, as in X, 21, where B omits the last five words, C attempts to supply the lacuna, getting correctly only the first two words, which were easy enough to supply.

Salmasius had clearly no MS but B to work upon, for not infrequently his corrections differ a good deal from F. Furthermore he so frequently agrees with a reading in the margin of B that one is tempted to examine into that point somewhat more closely. There are fifteen of these marginal corrections, running from IV, 3 to X, 10, and, what stands almost unpar-

¹³ Errors common to B and C, but not in A are, of course, not very numerous because B resembles A very closely anyway, and then Salmasius emended with the greatest freedom.

alleled in criticism, all but one are certainly right.¹⁴ Besides, they could not have been made from F, because in thirteen of the instances, F itself was corrupt. Now Salmasius followed these very closely; ten out of the fifteen he took over exactly; in three other instances his reading is (by oversight probably) not recorded by K. and R., but the chances are that he accepted the emendation; in one case, VII, 9, he followed the anonymous corrector in B in part but reversed the order of the supplied letters, writing $\bar{o}\bar{\tau}$ instead of $\bar{\tau}\bar{o}$; ¹⁵ and only once, V, 2, did he fail to follow. The credit then for this group of conjectures belongs to the anonymous corrector of B and not to Salmasius, and an editor should accordingly reverse the order of citation from "C B (margin)," as in K. and R., to "B (margin) C."

The brilliant record of success in emendation shows that these marginal readings are the work of no ordinary scholar. They were certainly not made by Salmasius himself, because one he overlooks and another he gets mixed up. Besides, they appear in only a little more than half of the work, while Salmasius copied the whole of it. One thinks at once of Casaubon, who spent ten years at Paris,¹⁶ and was greatly interested in Greek military writers as his *editio princeps* of Aeneas (1609),¹⁷ a closely related author, shows.¹⁸ The restriction of the correc-

¹⁴ I have not counted among these the correction in II, 2 *συνοπερια* where *o* is written in the lower margin, because that seems to be of a different kind from the others, and is separated from them by a number of pages.

¹⁵ This seems to constitute a certain proof that the marginal readings of B were used by Salmasius.

¹⁶ To be sure this particular MS was not yet in the Royal Library at the time when Casaubon was at Paris (it belonged to the Hurault Collection which was incorporated in the Royal Library in 1622; see Omont, *op. cit.*, I, p. xix) but a man like Casaubon must have seen numerous libraries and hundreds of MSS during the many years that he spent in France.

¹⁷ Thus Aeneas is contained in Par. 2522, 2435 [= B], and 2443; Asklepiodotos in Par. 2522, 2435 [= B], and 2528. Casaubon also intended at one time to publish Aelian's *Tactica* (preface to Polybius, p. 61), some MSS of which were at Paris, and copied a portion of Leo's *Tactica* (Mark Pattison: Isaac Casaubon, p. 184). Casaubon's emendations of Aeneas are numerous and almost uniformly correct.

¹⁸ To be sure Casaubon used MS 2443 for his text of Aeneas, published in 1609 (see his preface compared with Omont's Catalogue), and

tions to a portion of the MS is just what one might expect of the somewhat desultory habits of Casaubon, as he might have had only a short time in which to examine this MS, and jotted down his ready and sure corrections.

In the case of D photographs of folios 1, 4, and 5 recto and verso (= I, 1—II, 1 and III, 3—VII, 2) were collated as specimens. They are sufficient to determine the relationship and value of the MS so that no more photographs were made. D is descended from F, as is evident from the retention of many of its absurd readings, like I, 3 *χρησίμως ἐρᾶν*, etc. It was not, however, copied direct from F, since it omits in I, 4 the words *ἄσκησιν—παρατάξεως* along with ABC. It derives therefore from a common archetype of these three MSS. By the same token, and because of disagreement in peculiar readings like *κοσμούμενον* in I, 2; *αὐτῇ* I, 3; the omission of *ὥς πολλὰν* I, 3; *καταλοχῆσαι* II, 1, etc., D is not a descendant of V. It was copied with even greater fidelity than were A and B and reproduces not infrequently the exact form of F, as, e. g., I, tit. *φάλαγγον* (*φάλαγγος* ABC); I, 3 *τούς τε* (*δέ* ABC), etc. It disagrees also so frequently with ABC and B (margin) that it cannot derive directly from any of them, but it is unnecessary to present the complete evidence. Its emendations are:

I, 3 *ἀκοντίζωσιν*: (-σι F). Superfluous.

I, 4 *διαφοραὶ θ̄*: δ. *αἶδε* K. and R. Something is indeed lacking here, and a careful reading of the chapter will show that, as a matter of fact, exactly nine kinds of troops are mentioned, three of infantry, four of cavalry, and one each of chariots and elephants. But a bare number coming after the list is in itself unnatural, and such an enumeration of varieties by number alone is out of keeping with the style of the author. The emendation cannot, therefore, be accepted.

III, 5 *ἀμφοτέρωθεν*: -οθεν F. Obvious.

says nothing about any other MSS of that author, although there is nothing to preclude the possibility of his having known several MSS, even though he used only one. In fact Casaubon had in his own hands, but did not use, a much older MS of Aeneas than the one in the Royal Library which he published (Mark Pattison, op. cit., p. 185). Besides he remained at Paris for a year or more after his Polybius appeared, and might have come to know about this MS at that time.

III, 6 (and VI, 3) *ἐκτακτοι*, the first time with C: *ἐκτατοι* F. Obvious.

IV, 3 *κατά* with B (margin): *κα* F. Obvious.

IV, 4 *πήχεις μῆ* with B (margin) and C: *πήχει · μῆ* F. Obvious.

V, tit. *ιδέας: ειδέας* F. Simple.

V, 1 *ὀκταπάλαιστος: ὀκτοπ-* F. A change is needed, but that to *ω* (K. and R.) is more plausible.

V, 1 *πέμπτον: πέμπτον* F. Obvious, but the *τοῦ* supplied by K. and R. is also needed.

V, 1 *πήχεων: πηχεων* (sic) F, and *πηχεων* (sic): *πηχαίων* F. Simple changes to the Attic accent and the ordinary spelling.

V, 2 *εῖναι καὶ μὴ τὰς σαρισ* (sic), but in margin *εἰ καὶ μῆ* with B (margin) C K. and R., *τὰς σαρίσσας* with K. and R.: *ταῖς σαρίσσαις* B (margin) C. Very simple.

VI, 1 *λέγεται* with *Lex. Mil.* § 28 K. and R.: *λέγονται* F. Obvious.

VI, 3 *συστάσεων* with K. and R. Obvious.

VII, 2 *ῥομβοειδῆ: ῥομβοειδεῖ* F. Absurd.

VII, 2 *ἐταττον* with K. and R.: *ἐλάττων* F. Simple even if not quite obvious.

VII, 2 *ῥομβοειδούς . . . σφηνοειδούς . . . ἐμβολοειδούς* (sic) for *-és* in each case. Absurd.

Two of the changes quoted are clearly wrong, two unnatural, another merely superfluous. The remainder are either obvious or else simple for even an average intelligence. No account has been taken here, of course, of the numerous egregious errors which D leaves uncorrected. An even moderately serious difficulty like that of the "Babylonians" in V, 2 is quite beyond his powers. The three folios examined show no indication of an ability in emendation which would justify a collation of the remainder. Here and there, no doubt, "MS authority" of a certain kind would be given to a correction by Salmasius or by Köchly, but the value of such attestation is extremely slight, and *minima non curat praetor*.

E is carefully written by a competent scholar, P. D. Huet, who, however, was not more than twenty-two years of age at the time. Photographs of folios 75, 78 verso–79 verso (= I, 1–II, 1 and IV, 1–VII, 1) were collated as specimens. E does not derive from any MS of the family ABCD, because, aside from

a large number of disagreements in individual readings, it contains the seven omitted words ἄσκησιν—παρατάξεως in I, 4. Its original was either F itself or else a very close copy of it, since in many places it reproduces F's reading much better than ABC. It is not a copy of V for it has none of the latter's peculiar readings, while in I, 3 it contains the omitted words καὶ πολλήν. Clear mistakes like V, 2 τὸν πέμπτου ζυγόν are relatively rare.

Huet's emendations are:

IV, 1 ἐξεύρηται with C: ἐξηγήρηται F. Superfluous.

IV, 2 ἡ καὶ τὸ βάθος: κατὰ βάθος F κατὰ τὸ βάθος B. Since this change makes no proper sense, it may be merely a slip.

IV, 3 τὸ δίπηχυ with B (margin) C. Obvious.

IV, 3 κατὰ συνασπισμόν with B (margin) D. Obvious.

IV, 3 ἐπάγωμεν with B (margin). Obvious.

V, 1 οὐδὲ μείζω πλατεῖαν: μει ζολατεσ σαν (sic) F. A bad mistake.

V, 1 ϕ δὲ καί: ϕ δὴ καί F. Certainly wrong, and perhaps only a slip.

V, 1 πέμπτου with D. Obvious.

V, 2 In the "Babylonian" passage the only change is to write τῷ στοίχῳ with B (margin).

V, 2 εἶναι with F against B (margin) C D (margin), καὶ μὴ ταῖς σαρίσσαις with B (margin) C. The first part of this reading is certainly wrong, and the latter part an unnecessary change. As far as it goes, however, it tends to suggest that Huet *might* have been independent of the marginal emendations in B with which he agrees in every other instance in the folios which we have, thus, IV, 3 thrice; IV, 4; V, 2; VI, 1.

VI, 1 λέγεται with *Lex. Mil.* § 28 D. Obvious.

VI, 1 παρένταξιν with B (margin) C. Obvious.

VI, 2 ἡμῖν: ὑμῖν F (οὐ μὴν C is correct). Huet saw that there was a difficulty, but the remedy used is trite and shows no understanding of the context.

A majority of the foregoing changes are obvious, one is superfluous, two are bad mistakes, and two other changes may be mere slips. It is clear from such a showing that no emendations beyond the critical insight of a Hermann Köchly are likely to be found in the remainder of this MS, and that a complete collation, accordingly, would not repay the trouble which it would cost.

A new editor of Asklepiodotos, with a knowledge of F's reading, will doubtless be less inclined to introduce emendations than K. and R. who were handling only late MSS. In any event so well have the anonymous corrector, Salmasius, and Köchly done their work, that comparatively little remains to be gleaned. A few passages, however, may perhaps be discussed here not without profit, in view of the age and excellent character of F.

I, 2 it is said that the light-armed troops use "javelins, slings, καὶ ὅλως τοῖς ἐξ ἀποστήματος λεγομένοις τοξεύμασιν. τόξευμα as a general term for "missile" is apparently not otherwise attested, but it seems better to retain it here than with K. and R. to delete it and insert ὅπλοις after ὅλως. In a similar way φάλαγξ (I, title, and § 4; cf. Anon. Byzant., XV, 1) is used generically of any kind of military detachment.¹⁰

I, 3 καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐγγύθεν ὁμοίως βαρυτάτη κέχρηται σκευῇ, τοὺς τε (δὲ A B C μὲν K. and R.) ἵππους καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας πανταχόθεν θώραξι περισκέπον, μακροῖς † μὲν (δὲ K. and R.) χρώμενον καὶ αὐτὸ τοῖς δόρασιν, † ὃ καὶ δορατοφόρον τοῦτο καὶ ξυστοφόρον προσαγορεύεται κτλ. F. Here μὲν is certainly corrupt, and a little further on ὃ and τοῦτο surely cannot stand side by side. Everything runs smoothly, however, if we keep τε with F, and read μέντοι and δι' ὃ (cf. II, 7; δι' ᾧ, II, 9) below.

I, 3 ἄλλη (actually ἄλλη) F as against αὐτῇ Allatius and K. and R. has been discussed above.

II, 2 συνωμοσία (συνωμετια F corrected by A B [lower margin] C V) is to be retained, although not elsewhere attested, partly because it is designated here as an obsolete expression, and partly because of its proper formation and of the large list of closely related words.

II, 2 ὠνόμαστο K. and R. is a needless change from ὠνόμασται; and similarly in 4 διὰ τὸ παραλλήλους ἵστασθαι need not be changed to παρ' ἀλλήλοις (K. and R.) in an author as late as ours (despite ἀνὰ λόγον in III, 1; see below).

II, 9 σημειοφόρον (ἡμάφορον F) is out of its proper order. Inasmuch as Asklepiodotos is extremely exact in such matters,

¹⁰ That seems more natural than to suppose that this is a survival of the loose Homeric usage.

and the word as well as its explanation below in any event are corrupt,²⁰ it seems not improper to restore the correct order.

III, 1 γεωμέτριοι F: γεώμετροι K. and R. As neither word is attested elsewhere, F's reading may be preserved with some hesitation, though if one emended, γεωμετρικοί would involve less change than γεωμέτραι.

III, 1 ἐὰν τέσσαρα ἀνάλογον (ἀνάλογα Salmasius, K. and R.) ἦ F. Here τὰ seems necessary, because a particular group of just four numbers is mentioned. Also ἀνὰ λόγον which F's reading presupposes should be retained.

III, 6 ἐν τοῖς συνασπισμοῖς συνεδρεῖν ἀναγκάζοιεν F. K. and R. suggest συνερείδεν from Polybius, XII, 21, 3 which would be excellent. The well attested use of συνεδρεῖν in the sense "accompany," "be closely connected," may, however, justify the retention of F's reading here.

IV, 2 ἡ κατὰ βάθος, τε καὶ στοῖχον (l. στοιχεῖν) F. For τε, which is impossible, K. and R. suggest ὅπερ. Somewhat closer would be τὸ καί in the same sense, used as the common ὁ καί in papyri and inscriptions for alternative designations.

IV, 2 ὅπερ ὀνομάζεται καὶ παραστάτην ἐπιστάτην F. Salmasius emended to κατὰ παραστάτην καὶ ἐπιστάτην. In view of the fact, however, that the other terms just given are verb forms, perhaps we should read καὶ παραστατεῖν καὶ ἐπιστατεῖν.

VII, 1 τόπους ἀμείνους προκαταλαβεῖν καὶ τοὺς προκατελημμένους ἀναλαβεῖν. K. and R. change the last word to ἀναστείλαι, taking the preceding participle as middle. But it must be passive, a use which is well attested, and to change is clearly wrong.

VII, 2 πρὸς τε τὰς ἀπορίας καὶ τὰς ἐπιστροφὰς τῶν ἵππων F. For the impossible ἀπορίας K. and R. read ἀναστροφάς, a word which appears in paragraph 3 below. But here it seems to mean "wheeling round" in general, while ἐπιστροφή means "wheeling to face the enemy," and ἀποστροφή (which is closer also to F's reading), meaning "wheeling away from the enemy," is clearly the word needed here.

VII, 3 τὸ γὰρ μέτωπον τῶν ἐμβόλων βραχὺ γινόμενον F. For

²⁰ This corruption of both term and explanation although separated by several lines, suggests that both were in the margin of some ancestor MS and so especially subject to injury. If that be the case there need be no hesitation about shifting the present order slightly.

βραχὺ K. and R. read σφόδρα ὀξὺ, which is in a measure supported by the parallel passage in Arrian, XVIII, 4 τὸ μέτωπον ἐς ὀξὺ ἀπολῆγον. But βραχύ is logical and strictly speaking more exact than ὀξύ, while Aelian, in the parallel passage, who is clearly following Asklepiodotos very much more closely than Arrian, reads τὸ δὲ μέτωπον βραχύ τι γενόμενον. There is, therefore, no occasion to emend.

VII, 4 in speaking of cavalry formations a depth of τριῶν ἢ τεττάρων ἵπποτῶν is mentioned. K. and R. emend to ἵππων, but needlessly, since Asklepiodotos at the beginning of the paragraph speaks of depth of ὀκτὼ . . . ἄνδρας, and in treating schematic cavalry formations one can as readily say "men" as "horses."

X, 1. K. and R. bracket some seven terms in this paragraph, because there is no definition of them in what follows, suggesting that they may be interpolations from Aelian. This last is surely a counsel of desperation, for there is not the least suspicion that such an unlikely thing has happened anywhere else. As for στοιχεῖν and ζυγεῖν, these terms were defined in II, 6 and, though they are introduced here no doubt for the sake of completeness, it is superfluous to redefine them. Similarly in the case of παρεμβολή and the four other terms bracketed by K. and R. at the end of the paragraph, it is much better in view of the large number of undoubted lacunae in Asklepiodotos, to assume a lacuna in § 21, rather than delete these important technical terms. Besides, the first four of these terms are defined in VI, 1 and the fifth, ἐπίταξις, is perfectly clear from the definition of ἐπίταγμα in VII, 10, so that it is possible that here also, as in the case of στοιχεῖν and ζυγεῖν, Asklepiodotos may have intentionally omitted redefinitions.

X, 9, XII, 1 and 6 K. and R. needlessly change ἀποκαθιστάνειν of F (used by Polybius and Diodoros) to ἀποκαθιστάται.

X, 11 εἰ . . . ποιούμεθα τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν, τόπον ἐφέξει, κτλ. F. K. and R. read ποιούμεθα, but the mixed condition is paralleled by X, 12, εἰ . . . κελεύουντο . . . δέσσει, which K. and R. allow to stand, and further supported by XII, 4 εἰ . . . βουλούμεθα . . . παραγγελοῦμεν, where K. and R. needlessly change to βουλόμεθα.

X, 13 τὸ δὲ ἐστίν F. τόδε is clearly required, since only a single manoeuvre is described, not τάδε as K. and R. print.

X, 16. For *ισχυρὰ ποιείται* of F, Salmasius (followed by K. and R.) conjectures *ισχυροποιείται*, a needless change.

XI, 2 . . . οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῆς ὅλης φάλαγγος ἐκδέχασθαι δεῖ (χρή K. and R. after Salmasius, needlessly) ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μερῶν F. K. and R. delete γάρ. To be sure I find no other example of ἀλλὰ γὰρ καί, but the combination in the natural sense of "but indeed also" is appropriate here, while ἀλλὰ γὰρ δῆ is not uncommon, and Plato once uses ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὁμως (Rep., 432 C).

XII, 6 δύο ἐπιστροφὰς ἐπὶ τοαυτὸ (l. τὸ αὐτὸ) δόρν ποιῆσαι παραγγελοῦμεν F. K. and R. in order to keep δόρν supply τουτέστιν (an expression not found in Asklepiodotos) ἐπὶ. But the phrase is not in Aelian's excerpt (Tactica, XXXII, 6 δύο ποιήσομεν τοῦ συντάγματος ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπιστροφάς), and is utterly otiose, so that δόρν is much more likely to be an intruded gloss upon τὸ αὐτό.

XII, 10 προσήθωται was changed by K. and R. to προσείθισται. But Cod. S of Demosthenes gives forms of the perfect in ἤθ- (XXVI, 18; XXVII, 64; LXI, 14), and it is attested likewise by an inscription from Syros of 166-9 A. D. ταῖς ἡθισμέναις ἡμέραις (I. G. XII, 5, 662, 14), so that it seems best to retain the form, although unusual, here.

Since technical military terminology, especially for the Hellenistic period, has been somewhat inadequately treated in the lexicons, and since Asklepiodotos is the earliest authority to use many of these terms, for Suidas merely plundered the compiler of the *Military Lexicon*²¹ who drew largely from Aelian²² and

²¹ Best edited in K. and R., vol. II, 2, pp. 217 ff.; also in Bernhardt's ed. of Suidas, II, 2, pp. 1735 ff. This work was clearly put under considerable contribution by Stephanus in the first edition of the Thesaurus, but he gave no page or paragraph references, and by using several different appellations for it, *De re militari*; *De vocab. mil.*; *De vocab. castrensibus*, he seems to have confused the later editors, who generally leave such references untouched. When they have occasion to use the same work, they generally call it *Lex. ap. Montef. Bibl. Coislin.*, after Montfaucon's reproduction of the Coislin. MS. It would appear that they did not notice that this was identical with the work referred to by Stephanus, and neither they nor Stephanus made very systematic use of it.

²² References to Aelian's and Arrian's *Tactics* (given generally "Aelian-Arrian") are taken from the ed. of K. and R., II, 1, 1855.

Arrian (but also in part from Asklepiodotos), while these latter were dependent in part upon Asklepiodotos, it may not be amiss to record here the principal additions to the standard lexicons which Asklepiodotos affords. In the following list I shall give not merely what appear to be new words (marked with an *) but also special meanings of words and a few phrases which are either not recorded, or for which the evidence quoted comes from a much later period. In a few instances inexact definitions are corrected. References to the other Tacticians and to ancient lexicons are given only where false definitions are corrected. The lexicons used are the revised *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (1831-65), Liddell and Scott (8th edition), Van Herwerden, *Lexicon Suppletorium et Dialecticum*, 2nd ed., 1910.²³ When a term in the lexicons is adequately defined from Aelian, I have not thought it necessary to cite it here. When, however, only late authorities are adduced, it has seemed proper to point out the much earlier source.

ἄκρον, τό, *the wing of a line of battle* (= κέρασ), I, 3.

*ἀντιπορία, ἡ, *a counter-attack, or frontal attack*, X, 2.

ἀντίστομος, -ον; πορεία ἀντίστομος, *marching in two parallel columns, the lines of the front-rank-men on the inside*, XI, 3. L. and S., following the *Thesaurus*, regard this word which they know only from Arrian XXXVII, 7, as probably a false reading for ἀμφίστομος. But the two are totally different, as a comparison with Aelian, XXXIII, 3 (a passage which had fallen out in Arrian!) and Asklepiodotos, l. c., shows.

ἀποκατάστασις, ἡ, *return to original position, after wheeling or other evolutions*, X, 1; 9; 11. Cf. ἐπικατάστασις.

ἀποτομή, ἡ, ἀποτομή κέρατος, *a half-wing, or corps*, 4096 men in the typical phalanx, II, 10; III, 1 and 2.

*ἀραρός, τό, (neu. perf. ptcp. of ἀρασίσκω used as subst.), *joining-point, point of division between the two wings of an army* (cf. διχοτομία and ὀμφαλός), II, 6. The word occurs also

²³ W. Crönert's admirable revision of Passow in so far as it has reached our library extends only to the word ἀνά. It seems not to contain, however, ἄκρον as a technical term for "wing," κέρασ, although use is made in it for the first time systematically of our author, e. g. s. v. ἀκροβολιστής, ἀμφίστομος, etc.

in Arrian-Aelian, VII, 3 (corrupted into *δραρος* in the Mil. Lex., § 23, and *ἄραγος* in Suidas, s. v. *διχοτομία*).

**γεωμέτριος*, ὁ, *a geometrician*, III, 1 (if the reading of F be followed; v. supra, p. 138).

**διύπνεις*, ἡ, *a break-through with cavalry*, VII, 3.

διφαλαγία, ἡ, *a double-corps*, one-half of a phalanx, or 8192 men in the typical phalanx, II, 10. The term "double-phalanx" used by L. and S. is certainly misleading. To draw up an army in *διφαλαγία* formation is to divide the phalanx in two, placing one half behind the other, as is clear from Polybius, II, 66, 9; XII, 20, 7. See also Aelian-Arrian, IX, 9 and the Mil. Lex., §§ 18 and 19.

διχοτομία, ἡ, *joining-point*, point of division between the two wings of an army (cf. *ἀραρός* and *ὀμφαλός*), II, 6. The same meaning is given also by Aelian, VII, 3 and the Mil. Lex. § 23, along with the ordinary sense of *διχοτομία*, as a division into two equal parts, but Arrian, VII, 3 expresses it *ἵνα δέ πού ἡ διχοτομία γίνεται . . . ὀμφαλὸς ὀνομάζεται κτλ.*

ἑκτακτος, -ον; οἱ *ἑκτακτοὶ*, *supernumeraries*, attached originally to the *τάξις*, but later either to the *σύνταγμα*, II, 9, or the *ἐκατονταρχία* of light-armed troops, VI, 3, or else the phalanx of light-armed troops, VI, 3. The Thesaurus in an incomplete statement quotes only Aelian and the Mil. Lex.

ἐμπλέκω, *ἐμπλεκόμενοι*, *incorporate*, used of light-armed troops incorporated with the hoplites, man beside man, VI, 1.

ἐναντίος, -α, -ον; ἀπ' *ἐναντίας*, *on the contrary or other hand*, I, 2. Van Herwerden gives several examples from Procopius.

ἐνωμοτία, ἡ, *a quarter of a file* (*λόχος*), II, 2. For this same use of the word in Hellenistic tactics, see Aelian-Arrian, V, 2, and the Mil. Lex. § 4, and compare K. and R., II, 2, pp. 243 f.

ἐξάριθμος, -ον, *outside the normal number, in addition to it, supernumerary*, II, 9. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex.

ἐξελίσσω, *countermarch*, X, 1; XII, 11. The lexicons give only the meaning *deploy*, although L. and S. give *countermarching* as one of the meanings of *ἐξελιγμός*. The sense

countermarch is amply attested by Aelian-Arrian, XXVII, 1-5, and the Mil. Lex., § 39.

ἐπιθηραρχία, ἡ, *a unit of four war-elephants*, IX, 1.

ἐπικαθίστημι, *to advance to original position*, X, 11. Cf. ἐπικατάσταςις.

*ἐπικατάσταςις, ἡ, *advance to original position*, after wheeling, X, 1 and 9. Cf. ἀποκατάσταςις.

ἐπικοινωνέω, *to be attached to, or stationed upon*, I, 3.

ἐπιξεναγός, ὁ, *commander of an ἐπιξεναγία*, i. e. 2048 ψιλοί, VI, 3.

The Thesaurus refers only to the Mil. Lex.

ἐπίταγμα, τό, *supporting force*, especially the phalanx of ψιλοί, 8192 men, VI, 3; VII, 10.

ἐπίταξις, ἡ, *supporting position*, X, 1 (cf. VII, 10).

ἐπιφάνεια, ἡ, *facing*, to the right or to the left, X, 4.

*ἐτεροστόμως, adv. of ἐτερόστομος, used of the march of an army in column when the front-rank-men are on different sides of the two wings, XI, 4.

ζυγαρχία, ἡ, *a military unit of two war-chariots*, VIII, 1. L. and S. quote Asklepiodotos, indeed, but suggest the wrong definition, as of the command of a captain of cavalry. The Thesaurus fails to give the passage in Aelian. It is XXII, 2.

ζώαρχος, ὁ, *the commander of one war-elephant*, IX, 1. L. and S. take the word in Aelian, XXIII, 1 incorrectly as an adjective.

*ἡμισιάζω, *to halve*, τὸ βάθος ἡμισίαζε, XII, 11.

θηραρχία, ἡ, *a unit of two war-elephants*, IX, 1.

θήραρχος, ὁ, *a commander of two war-elephants*, IX, 1.

ἑλάρχης, ὁ, *a commander of eight war-elephants*, IX, 1. The Thesaurus gives the correct meaning, but quotes no authority. Add Aelian, XXIII, 1 (εἰλάρχης).

ἵππαρχία, ἡ, *two Ταραντιναρχίαι of cavalry*, VII, 11. The Thesaurus gives the correct meaning but quotes no authority. Add Aelian, XX, 2, and the Mil. Lex., § 32.

ἰσοσθενέω, *be equally strong*, ἰσοσθενεῖν, III, 4; ἰσοσθενήσουσι, III, 2. The Thesaurus and L. and S. quote only Galen and Cyril of Alexandria.

κεράρχης, ὁ, *the commander of a κέρασ*, or wing, composed of 8192 men, II, 10; or, especially, *the commander of 32 war-*

elephants, IX, 1. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex.

κέρας, τό, *a squadron of 32 war-chariots*, VIII, 1.

κοιλέμβολος, ό, *hollow wedge*, XI, 5. L. and S. and the Thesaurus give only *κοιλέμβολον* from Suidas.

λοξός, -ή, -όν; *λοξή φάλαγξ*, *a phalanx in march with extended front, one wing in advance of the other*, X, 1; XI, 1.

λοχαγός, ό, *the front man and leader of a file* (λόχος), II, 2.

μεταγωγή, ή, *wheeling, manoeuvring*, VII, 5.

μῆκος, τό, *the first line of a phalanx*, II, 5.

ξεναγία, ή, *two battalions of ψιλοί*, *a regiment of 512 men*, VI, 3 [supplied from Aelian, XVI, 3].

**όκταλογία*, ή, *a unit of eight λόχοι*, II, 9.

**όκτωπάλαιστος*, -ον, *of eight palms*, approximately 24 inches, V, 1.

**όμοιοστόμως*, adverb of *όμοióστομος*, used of marching in parallel columns, or also in sequence, the line of front-rank-men on the same side of each division, XI, 3; XI, 4.

όρθός, -ή, -όν, *eis όρθόν άποδοῦναι*, *to face the front originally held, lines front*, X, 1.

οὔρά, ή; *ἐπ' οὔράν*, *about-face to the rear from the enemy; άπ' οὔρας*, *about-face from the rear toward the enemy*, X, 3. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex.

οὔραγός, ό, *the last man in file* (λόχος), II, 2; III, 6, etc., the man at the rear angle of a squadron, VII, 2; a supernumerary to the τάξις, II, 9; or to the *έκατονταρχία*, VI, 3.

όχηματικός, -ή, -όν, *pertaining to the mounted force of an army*, whether cavalry, chariots, or elephants, I, 1 and 3. L. and S. (following the Thesaurus) quote only a gloss in the sense "of or for a vehicle."

παραγωγή, ή, *march-in line*, where the phalanx on the march keeps its original battle-line, whether marching with extended front or in column, X, 1; XI, 1 ff. L. and S. give only "a wheeling from column into line," but the usage of Asklepiodotos is attested by Aelian-Arrian, XXVI, 3 and the Mil. Lex., § 48.

παράταξις, ή, *the first line of a phalanx*, II, 5.

πεντηκονταρχία, ή, *two squads of ψιλοί*, *a platoon*, consisting of 64 men. VI, 3. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex. Add Aelian-Arrian, XVI, 1.

πλάγιος, -α, -ον; πλαγία φάλαγξ, an army in march with the front extended, X, 1; XI, 1.

πρόπτωσις, ἡ, projection of spears in front of a phalanx, V, 1.

*προσένταξις, ἡ, flank position, used of light infantry stationed on the wings of the phalanx, VI, 1.

πρόταξις, ἡ, van position of ψιλοί, VI, 1. The Thesaurus quotes only Suidas and the Mil. Lex. Compare προτασσόμενοι, Aelian, XV, 1.

σημειοφόρος, ὁ, signalman, II, 9; VI, 3. L. and S. (following the Thesaurus) give only the meaning "standardbearer." The Mil. Lex. § 14 (here clearly following Asklepiodotos) gives both term and definition, while Aelian, IX, 4 contains merely the term without definition.

Σκύθης, ὁ, archer-cavalry, I, 3.

στίφος, τό, two divisions of ψιλοί, a corps, of 4096 men, VI, 3.

στρατηγός, ὁ, a general, formerly of a corps of 4096 men, but properly of a full phalanx, II, 10.

σύζευξις, ἡ; κατὰ σύζευξιν, used of an army marching in parallel columns, XI, 2.

συλλοχισμός, ὁ, drawing up by files, an arrangement of the phalanx with files parallel, II, 5. The Thesaurus quotes only the Mil. Lex. (= § 7). Add Aelian VI, 1.

συνεδρεύω, close up, draw together, of troops taking up the compact formation, III, 6 (cf. above, p. 138).

συνεπισκέπω, συνεπισκέπεσθαι, protect at the same time, of a shield for man and horse, I, 3.

σύνταγμα, a double τάξις, or a battalion, composed of 16 files, II, 8; III, 6; = συνταξιαρχία, II, 10.

*συνταξιαρχία, ἡ, a battalion, II, 9; takes the place of σύνταγμα, II, 10; III, 3 and 4.

*συνωμοτία, ἡ, a band of sworn soldiers, early designation of a file, II, 2 (cf. above, p. 137).

σύστασις, ἡ, four files of ψιλοί, a squad, consisting of 32 men, VI, 3.

ταξιαρχία, ἡ, a command of eight files of infantry, = τάξις, II, 10; III, 4.

ταξίαρχος, ὁ, commander of a τάξις or ταξιαρχία, II, 8.

τάξις, ἡ, a company, the same as ταξιαρχία, eight files of infantry, II, 8 and 9.

Ταραντίνοι, οἱ, cavalry who fight only with javelins at a distance, I, 3. Listed and correctly defined only in Pape-Benseler: Wörterb. d. griech. Eigennamen.

τέλος, τό, *a division of infantry*, the same as *μεραρχία*, of 2048 men, II, 10; in cavalry, a half phalanx, VII, 11.

τόξευμα, τό, *a missile of any kind*, I, 2 (cf. above, p. 137).

τοξότης, ὁ, *archer-cavalry*, a special branch, the same as *Σκύθης*, I, 3.

ὑπερβάλλω; τὸ κέρας ὑπερβαλέσθαι, *to outflank on one wing only*, opposed to ὑπερφαλαγγέω, *outflank on both wings*, X, 2 and 18.

ὑποβαίνω, *follow*, as one rank at a certain interval behind another, V, 1.

ὑποστολή, ἡ; δι' ὑποστολῆς, *holding back*, X, 21.

ὑπόταξις, ἡ, *a rear-position*, used of light infantry stationed behind the phalanx, VI, 1.

φαλαγγάρχης, ὁ, *commander of a φαλαγγαρχία*, or corps, 4096 men, II, 10; *commander of the phalanx of war-elephants*, 64 in number, IX, 1.

φαλαγγαρχία, ἡ, *a corps*, 4096 men, II, 10. L. and S. suggest that the word is equivalent to *phalanx*, and quote only Suidas and the Byzantines. But the meaning as given above appears also in Aelian-Arrian, IX, 8, and in the Mil. Lex., § 17.

φάλαγξ, ἡ, *any branch of the army*, chapter heading I; I, 4; *the force of hoplites*, 16,384 men, II, 10, etc.; the full force of 64 war-chariots, VIII, 1.

W. A. OLDFATHER.